the question of any one ignoring them does not arise.

(d) The findings of the Special Team are still under scrutiny and no opinion can be formed or conclusion arrived at, till the scrutiny is completed.

Submission of details by drug formulators

877. CHOWDHARY RAM SEWAK: Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS be pleased to state:

(a) what are the names of formulations in respect of which notices for overcharging have been issued to formulators during the last three years:

(b) whether it is a fact that majority of the formulators have not provided the details as asked for by his Ministry; and

(c) if so, what are the names of those formulators and what steps have been taken to get the required details?

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY): (a) A statement giving the requisite details to the extent available is annexed. (*See* below).

(b) and (c) It is a fact that most of the formulators are reluctant to provide the details asked for by the Government to calculate the amount of unintended benefit. The Government has already decided to give them a final hearing before launching prosecution against such companies.

Statement

S. No.	Name of the Company	Name of the Formulations
1.	M/s. Carews Pharmaceuticals	Combiflam tablets
2.	M/s. Celsus Pharmaceuticals	Ibudex Capsules
3.	M/s. Inlar (I) Ltd.	Dexatopic Cream
4.	M/s. Lyka Labs.	Flucort Range of formulations.
5.	M/s. Novocare Pvt. Ltd.	Magadol tablets
6.	M/s. Ultim Pharmaceuticals	Proxyvon range of formulations
7.	M/s. Sandoz (I) Ltd.	Multi vitamins
8.	M/s. Abbott Labs.	Multi Vitamins
9.	M/s. Pfizer Ltd.	Multivitamins plus Protinex
10.	M/s. Parke Davis including M/s. Warner Hindustan	Multi Vitamins

Liabilities of M/s. Glaxo and M/s. Hoechst

878. SHRI DHULESHWAR MEENA:
SHRI ASHOK NATH VERMA:

Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Special Team did not collect the details from M/s Glaxo and M/s. Hoechst which were required for determining the liabilities of these companies as reported in 'Hindustan Times' of the 28th July, 1990;

(b) when was the standard format designed by Special Team and what was the information asked;

(c) when was the format sent to these companies;

(d) what are the details of visits by Special Team to each company and what was the purpose of these visits and to what extent it was accomplished;

(e) what are the reasons for short assessment by Special Team;

(f) whether any exlpanation has been called from Special Team; and

(g) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY): (a) Special Team was not required to assess the liability in the case of M/s. Glaxo. However, in the case of M/s. Hoechst, some details for the purpose of determining the liability were collected by the Special Team.

(b) to (g) Information to the extent available would be collected and laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha.

Assessment of overcharged amount on on Glybenclamide

879. SHRI DHULESHWAR MEENA:
SHRI ASHOK NATH VERMA:

Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS be pleased to refer to the answer to Starred Question 5 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 30th April, 1990 and state:

(a) what is the amount assessed against M/s. Hoechst by the Special Team in respect of Glybenclamide;

(b) what is the assessment of amount as a result of the review ordered by him;

(c) by when the amount upto 1987 would be assessed;

(d) whether it is a fact that his Ministry have found deliberate favour in the assessment of liability of this company during scrutiny; and

(e) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY): (a) Special Team tentatively assessed an amount of Rs. 2.59 lakhs upto December 1983 in respect of Glybenclamide.

(b) After review, the amount has been tentatively revised to Rs. 6.49 lakhs upto December, 1983.

(c) After completing the Review upto 1983 and finalising the liability, amount upto 25th August, 1987 would also be assessed.

(d) and (e) It is difficult to arrive at any conclusion till the process of review is completed.

Overcharging of flucort range of formulations

880. SHRI DHULESHWAR MEENA:
SHRI ASHOK NATH VERMA:
SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU:
SMT. SATYA BAHIN:

Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 768 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 14th May, 1990 and state:

(a) what are the details of prices fixed and prices charged for Flucort range of formulations under DPCO, 1979;

(b) whether it is a fact that his Ministry has not received the details asked for in the notices;

(c) if so, what legal action has been taken against the producers: and

(d) when were the prices fixed and since when the producer has been overcharging the consumer and what is the present price of each formulation?

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY): (a) A Statement I giving the requisite details is annexed. *(See* below).

(b) and (c) Yes, Sir. The Company has not furnished the complete details asked for by the Government. Before Government could proceed against them, the Company has filed a Writ Petition in the Bombay High Court.